



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,428	03/08/2002	Wen-Yeu Lee	LEFW3002/EM	8780

23364 7590 10/06/2003

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KIM, ELLEN E.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2874

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,428	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ellen E Kim	2874	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Mansfield et al [USPAT 5,842,622].

Mansfield et al disclose a conversion kits for curved-angle cleaving of optical fibers comprising a base [fig. 4], an optical fiber clamp [abstract], a cutting device 41 having a connecting rod pivotably mounted on a slide base, and a bending device 38 [fig. 5A-5C] comprising a pushing shaft.

In re claim 13, the rubber pad 34 is shown [fig. 4].

In re claim 16, a pushing hammer 38 functions as an adjustment device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4-6, 8-10, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansfield et al.

In re claims 4-6, Mansfield et al discloses every aspect of claimed invention except for the roller. Mansfield et al, however, teach at column 7, lines 46-56 that the flaw producing device is movable. Official Notice is taken that the roller for smooth sliding is old and well known in the art. See In Re Malcolm 1942 C.D. 589:543 O.G. 440 MPEP 706.02 (a).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Mansfield et al's device to include the roller for the purpose of smooth sliding of the flaw producing device.

In re claims 8-10, Mansfield et al discloses every aspect of claimed invention except for the switch and the spring. Official Notice is taken that the spring and the push button switch to open and close the optical fiber clamp is old and well known in the art. See In Re Malcolm 1942 C.D. 589:543 O.G. 440 MPEP 706.02 (a).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Mansfield et al's device to include the push button switch and the spring for the purpose of stable displacement of the optical fiber clamp.

In re claim 20, Mansfield et al discloses every aspect of claimed invention except for the rubber pad on the bending blade. Official Notice is taken that the rubber pad is

old and well known in the art. See In Re Malcolm 1942 C.D. 589:543 O.G. 440 MPEP 706.02 (a).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Mansfield et al's device to include the rubber pad on the bending blade for the purpose of easier holding of the bending blade.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not disclose or suggest a hand-held optical fiber cutting apparatus comprising all the specific elements with the specific combination including an adjustment device comprising adjustment slider abutting an oblique face of the slide base as set forth in claim.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/092,428
Art Unit: 2874

Page 5

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Further references of interest are cited on Form PLO-892, which is attachment to this office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-4946. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday.

Ellen E. Kim
Primary Examiner



September 25, 2003/EK